Asynchronous Incremental Stochastic Dual Descent Algorithm for Network Resource Allocation

Amrit S. Bedi, *Student Member, IEEE* and Ketan Rajawat, *Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1702.08290v1 [math.OC] 27 Feb 2017

***Abstract*—Stochastic network optimization problems entail finding resource allocation policies that are optimum on an average but must be designed in an online fashion. Such problems are ubiquitous in communication networks, where resources such as energy and bandwidth are divided among nodes to satisfy certain long-term objectives. This paper proposes an asynchronous incremental dual decent resource allocation algorithm that utilizes delayed stochastic gradients for carrying out its updates. The proposed algorithm is well-suited to heterogeneous networks as it allows the computationally-challenged or energy-starved nodes to, at times, postpone the updates. The asymptotic analysis of the proposed algorithm is carried out, establishing dual convergence under both, constant and diminishing step sizes. It is also shown that with constant step size, the proposed resource allocation policy is asymptotically near-optimal. An application involving multi-cell coordinated beamforming is detailed, demonstrating the usefulness of the proposed algorithm.**

***Index Terms*—Stochastic subgradient, resource allocation, asynchronous algorithm, incremental algorithm.**

I. Introduction

The recent years have witnessed an unprecedented growth in the complexity and bandwidth requirements of network services. The resulting stress on the network infrastructure has motivated the network designers to move away from simpler or modular architectures and towards optimum ones. To make sure that resources such as bandwidth and energy are allocated efficiently, optimum designs advocate cooperation between the network nodes [1], [2]. This paper considers the problem of cooperative network resource allocation that arises in wireless communication networks [3], [4], smart grid systems [5], [6], and in the context of scheduling [7], [8]. Of particular interest is the stochastic resource allocation problem, where the goal is to find an allocation policy that is asymptotically optimal [9], [10]. Although such problems are infinite dimensional in nature, they can be solved in an online fashion via stochastic dual descent methods, allowing real-time resource allocation that is also asymptotically near-optimal [11]–[13].

Heterogeneous networks are common to a number of applications where the energy availability, computational capability, or the mode of operation of the nodes is not the same across the network. Key requirements for heterogeneous network protocols include scalability, robustness, and tolerance to delays and packet losses. Towards this end, a number of distributed algorithms have been proposed in the literature [14]–[21]. By eliminating the need for a fusion center, the distributed algorithms operate with reduced communication overhead, and render the network resilient to single-point failures.

Most distributed algorithms still place stringent communication and computational requirements on the network nodes. For instance, the dual stochastic gradient methods entail multiple updates and message exchanges per time slot, and cannot handle missed or delayed updates. In heterogeneous networks, such delays are often unavoidable, arising due to poor channel conditions, traffic congestion, or limited processing power at certain nodes. This paper proposes a distributed asynchronous stochastic resource allocation algorithm that tolerates such delays. The next subsection outlines the main contributions of this paper.

The authors are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, IIT Kanpur, Kanpur (UP), India 208016 (email: amritbd, ketan@iitk.ac.in).

A. Contributions and organization

The stochastic resource allocation problem is formulated as a constrained optimization problem where the goal is to maximize a network-wide utility function. The allocated resources at the different nodes in the network are coupled through constraint functions that involve expectations with respect to a random network state. Specifically, the aim is to find an allocation policy that satisfies the constraints on an average. The distribution of the state variables is not known, so that the optimization problem does not admit an offline solution. Instead, the idea is to observe the instances of the state variables over time, and allocate resources in an online manner. It is well-known that stochastic dual descent algorithms yield viable online algorithms for such problems [12].

Within the heterogeneous network setting considered here, the focus is on distributed algorithms that can tolerate communication and processing delays [16], [22], [23]. Different from the state-of-the-art algorithms that utilize the standard stochastic gradient methods [11], [23], [24], we develop two variants of the asynchronous dual descent algorithm that allow some of the nodes in the network to temporarily "fall back," in the event of low energy availability, unusually large processing delay, node shutdown, or channel impairments. The first asynchronous variant utilizes a fusion center to collect the possibly delayed gradients from various nodes and carry out the updates (cf. III-A). The second variant eliminates the need for the fusion center, and instead utilizes the fully distributed and incremental stochastic gradient descent algorithm, where the nodes carry out updates in a round-robin fashion and pass messages along a cycle (cf. III-B). As earlier, the use of stale gradients for primal and dual updates, allows the algorithm to be run on two different clocks, one corresponding to the local resource allocation and tuned to the changing random network state, while the other dictated by the message passing protocol. The key feature of the proposed algorithm is the possibility for the second clock to slow down temporarily and wait for slower nodes to catch up. The proposed algorithm thus allows timely resource allocation, while tolerating occasional delays in message passing.

The asymptotic performance of the proposed algorithm is studied under certain regularity conditions on the problem structure and bounded delays. In particular, the asymptotic performance of the asynchronous incremental stochastic (AIS) gradient descent algorithm is characterized under both, diminishing and constant step-sizes. The overall structure of the proof is based on the convergence results in the incremental stochastic gradient descent algorithm of [14] and the asynchronous incremental subgradient method of [15]. Specific to the resource allocation problem at hand, the asymptotic near-optimality and almost sure feasibility of

the primal allocation policy is established for the case of constant step sizes. It is remarked that since the proposed algorithms utilize stochastic gradient descent, their computational complexity is also comparable to other distributed stochastic algorithms [14], [16]–[21], [23], [25], [26]. The calculation of the gradient is the most computationally expensive step, and like other first-order algorithms, must be carried out at every time slot.

Finally, the stochastic coordinated multi-cell beamforming problem is formulated and solved via the proposed algorithm. Detailed simulations are carried out to demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed algorithm in delay-prone and distributed environments. Summarizing, the main contributions of the paper include (a) the AIS algorithm and its convergence (b) primal near-optimality and feasibility results for the allocated resources; and (c) demonstration of the proposed algorithm on a practical stochastic coordinated multi-cell beamforming problem.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Sec. I-B provides an outline of the related literature. Sec. II describes the problem formulation and recapitulates the known results. Sec. III details the proposed algorithm. Sec. IV lists the required assumptions, and provides the primal and dual convergence results. Sec. V formulates the stochastic version of the coordinated beamforming problem along with the relevant simulation results. Finally, Sec. VI concludes the paper.

B. Related work

Resource allocation problems have been well-studied in the context of cross-layer optimization in networks [27]. Popular tools for solving stochastic resource allocation problems include the backpressure algorithm [3] and variants of the stochastic dual descent method [12], [24]. However, most of these works only consider synchronous algorithms, and the effect of communication delays has not been examined in detail. An exception is the asynchronous subgradient method proposed in [22], where delayed subgradients were utilized for resource allocation. The present work extends the algorithm in [22] by allowing delayed stochastic subgradients. Additionally, the proposed algorithm is also incremental, and is therefore applicable to a wider variety of problems.

Depending on the mode of communication among the nodes, distributed algorithms can be broadly classified into three categories, namely, diffusion, consensus, and incremental [28]. Of these, the incremental update rule generally incurs the least amount of message passing overhead [29], and is of interest in the present context. The incremental gradient descent and its variants have been widely applied to large-scale problems, and generally exhibit faster convergence than the traditional steepest descent algorithm and its variants [30], [31].

The stochastic gradient and subgradient algorithms are well-known within the machine learning and signal processing communities [23], [32]–[34]. The incremental stochastic subgradient method, with cyclic, random, and Markov incremental variants, was first proposed in [14]. The asymptotic analysis of dual problem in the present work follows the same general outline as that of the cyclic incremental algorithm in [14], with additional modifications introduced to handle asynchrony. It is emphasized that these modifications are not straightforward, since the delayed stochastic subgradient is not generally a descent direction on an average. The present work also allows delays in both, primal and dual update steps, and establishes asymptotic near-optimality and feasibility of the primal allocation policies.

Asynchronous algorithms have also been considered within the Markov decision process framework [35], though the setup there is quite different and does not apply to the problem at hand. On the other hand, asynchronous first order methods have attracted a significant interest from the machine learning community [23], [25]. For problems where the exact subgradient is available at each node, the asynchronous alternating directions method of multiplier (ADMM) has been well-studied [16]–[18]. The present work considers stochastic algorithms, and thus differs considerably in terms of both analysis and the final results. Even among algorithms utilizing stochastic subgradients, the definition of asynchrony varies across different works. One way to model asynchrony is to allow each node to carry out its update according to a local Poisson clock. This approach is followed in [19]–[21], all of which consider various consensus-based distributed subgradient algorithms. The asynchronous adaptive algorithms in [36] also subscribe to the same philosophy, with decoupled node-updates due to communication errors, changing topology, and node failures. The incremental algorithm considered here is very different in terms of operation and analysis.

On the other hand, asynchronous operation can be modeled via delayed gradients or subgradients utilized for the updates. A consensus-based stochastic algorithm proposed in [26], and utilizes randomly delayed stochastic gradients. The incremental algorithm considered here also allows stale subgradients, while incurring significantly lower communication overheads. Asynchronous variants of the classical or averaged stochastic gradient methods have been proposed in [23], [37]–[40]. The generic problem of interest here is that of the minimization of a sum of private functions at various nodes. Further, a network with star topology is considered, with updates being carried out using delayed gradients collected at the fusion center. Different from these works, the proposed algorithm is incremental, does not require a fusion center, and is therefore more relevant to the network resource allocation problem at hand. Unlike these works, the present work also avoids making any assumptions on the compactness of the domain of the dual optimization problem. Before concluding, it is remarked that this work develops convergence results that hold on an average. Stronger results, where convergence is established in an almost sure sense, require a more involved analysis, and are not pursued here.

The notation used in this paper is as follows. Scalars are represented by small letters, vectors by small boldface letters, and constants by capital letters. The index t is used for the time or iteration index. The inner product between vectors $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ is denoted by $\langle \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b} \rangle$. For a vector $\mathbf{x}$, projection onto the non-negative orthant is denoted by $[\mathbf{x}]^+$. The expectation operation is denoted by $\mathbb{E}$. All results established here hold for any vector norm, denoted generically by $\|\cdot\|$. By default, the indices in $\sum_{i,t}$ range over $1 \leq i \leq K$ and $1 \leq t \leq T$.

II. Problem formulation

A. Problem statement

This section details the stochastic resource allocation problem at hand for a network with K nodes. The stochastic component of the problem is captured through the random network state,

comprising of the random vectors $\mathbf{h}^i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ for each node $i \in \{1,\ldots,K\}$, with unknown distributions. The overall problem is formulated as follows.

$$\mathsf{P} := \max \sum_{i=1}^{K} f^i(\mathbf{x}^i) \tag{1a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K} \mathbf{u}^i(\mathbf{x}^i) + \mathbf{v}^i(\mathbf{h}^i, \mathbf{p}^i_{\mathbf{h}^i})\right] \geq 0 \tag{1b}$$

$$\mathbf{x}^i \in \mathcal{X}^i,\ \mathbf{p}^i \in \mathcal{P}^i \tag{1c}$$

where the optimization variables include the resource allocation variables $\{\mathbf{x}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n\}_{i=1}^K$ and the policy functions $\{\mathbf{p}^i : \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}^p\}_{i=1}^K$, under the constraints (1b)-(1c). Note that, the constraints in (1b) are required to be satisfied on an average, whereas those in (1c) are needed to be satisfied instantaneously. The functions $f^i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ are assumed to be concave, and the sets $\mathcal{X}^i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, convex and compact. The constraint function at node i is vector-valued, and is given by $\mathbf{u}^i(\mathbf{x}^i) := [u^i_1(\mathbf{x}^i) \cdots u^i_d(\mathbf{x}^i)]^T$, where $\{u^i_k(\mathbf{x}^i) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}\}_{k=1}^d$ are concave functions. On the other hand, no such restriction is imposed upon the vector-valued function $\mathbf{v}^i : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and the compact set of functions $\{\mathcal{P}^i\}_{i=1}^K$. Of course, the overall problem still needs to adhere to certain regularity conditions (see Sec. IV), such as the Slater's constraint qualification and Lipschitz continuity of the gradient function; see (**A1**)-(**A7**).

Since the distribution of $\mathbf{h}^i$ is also not known in advance, it is generally not possible to solve for P in an offline manner. Therefore, an online algorithm is sought to solve problem 'on the fly' as the independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables $\{\mathbf{h}^i_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ are realized and observed. For brevity, we denote $\mathbf{p}^i_t := \mathbf{p}^i_{\mathbf{h}^i_t}$ and $\mathbf{g}^i_t(\mathbf{p}^i_t, \mathbf{x}^i) := \mathbf{u}^i(\mathbf{x}^i) + \mathbf{v}^i(\mathbf{h}^i_t, \mathbf{p}^i_{\mathbf{h}^i_t})$. Therefore, it is possible to write (1b) equivalently as $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K} \mathbf{g}^i_t(\mathbf{p}^i_t, \mathbf{x}^i)\right] \geq 0$. The algorithm outputs a sequence of vector pairs $\{\mathbf{x}^i_t, \mathbf{p}^i_t\}_t$, that are used for allocating resources in a timely manner. Towards this end, the stochastic dual descent algorithm has been proposed in [12], which yields allocations that are almost surely near-optimal and provably convergent.

In the present paper, the focus is on networked systems where both, allocations $(\mathbf{x}^i, \mathbf{p}^i)$ and the functions f^i and $\mathbf{g}^i_t$ are private to each node i. Likewise, the random variable $\mathbf{h}^i_t$ is also observed and estimated locally at each node i. In other words, while the nodes can exchange dual variables and numerical values of the gradients, they may not be willing to reveal the full functional form of the objective or constraint functions and other locally estimated quantities, owing to privacy and security concerns. Such *privacy-preserving* cooperation is common for many secure multi-agent systems [18], [41], [42]. To this end, the nodes may be arranged in a star topology, and utilize a centralized controller for collecting and distributing various algorithm iterates. Alternatively, ring topology may be used, allowing a fully distributed implementation, where the exchanges occur only between two immediate neighbors. In order to clarify the problem formulation considered in (1), the following simple example is considered.

Example 1. Consider the problem of network utility maximization over a wireless network consisting of K nodes. The aim is to maximize the network-wide utility given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{K} U(r^i) \tag{2}$$

where $U(\cdot)$ is a concave function that quantifies the utility obtained by the node i upon achieving a rate $r^i \in [r_{\min}, r_{\max}]$. The channel is assumed to be time-varying, and for each channel realization h^i, node i allocates the power $p^i_{h^i}$, achieving the instantaneous rate of $\log(1 + h^i p^i_{h^i})$, where the noise power is assumed to be one. The goal is to maximize the utility in (2) subject to constraints on the average rate and the average power consumption, and the full problem can be written as (cf. (1)):

$$\max_{r^i, p^i} \sum_{i=1}^{K} U(r^i) \tag{3a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K}\left(\frac{1}{2}\log(1 + h^i p^i_{h^i})\right)\right] \geq \sum_{i=1}^{K} r^i \tag{3b}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K} p^i_{h^i}\right] \leq P_{\max} \tag{3c}$$

$$r^i \in [r_{\min}, r_{\max}],\ p^i \in \mathcal{P}^i \tag{3d}$$

It is remarked that $\mathcal{P}^i$ is a set of functions $p^i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, while $p^i_{h^i}$ is a random variable that depends on h^i. That is, the optimization variables in (3) include the rates r^i and the power allocation functions p^i.

B. Existing approaches and challenges

Since the number of constraints in (1) are finite, the problem is more tractable in the dual domain. To this end, introducing a dual variable $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ corresponding to constraint in (1b), the stochastic (sub-)gradient descent method was proposed for solving such problems in [12]. The Lagrangian of (1) is given by

$$L(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}) = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \left\{ f^i(\mathbf{x}^i) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}^i_t(\mathbf{p}^i_t, \mathbf{x}^i)\right]\rangle \right\} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ collect the primal optimization variables $\{\mathbf{x}^i\}_{i=1}^K$ and $\{\mathbf{p}^i\}_{i=1}^K$ respectively. Next, the dual function is obtained by maximizing L with respect to $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{P}$. Since the Lagrangian is expressed as a sum of K terms, each depending on a different set of variables, the maximization operation is separable and the dual function takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{K} \max_{\mathbf{x}^i \in \mathcal{X}^i,\ \mathbf{p}^i \in \mathcal{P}^i} \left[f^i(\mathbf{x}^i) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}^i_t(\mathbf{p}^i_t, \mathbf{x}^i)\right]\right)\rangle \right] \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^{K} D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The dual problem is given by

$$\mathsf{D} = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^d_+} \sum_{i=1}^{K} D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}). \tag{6}$$

While for general problems, it only holds that $\mathsf{D} \geq \mathsf{P}$, the stochastic resource allocation problem considered here has a zero duality gap, i.e., $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{D}$. The result holds under certain regularity conditions, namely, strict feasibility (Slater's condition), bounded

subgradients, and continuous cumulative distribution function of $\mathbf{h}^i$ for each i. A generic proof for this result is provided in [22, Prop. 6], and utilizes the Lyapunov's convexity theorem. It is remarked that similar results are well-known in economics [43], wireless communications [44], [45], and control theory [46].

The result on zero duality gap legitimizes the dual descent approach, since the dual problem is always convex, and the resultant dual solution can be used for primal recovery. To this end, similar problems in various contexts have been solved via the classical dual descent algorithm [22], [45], [47], wherein the primal updates utilize various sampling techniques.

Note that the distribution of $\mathbf{h}^i$ is not known in advance, and solving (6) via classical first or second order descent methods requires a costly Monte Carlo sampling step [24]. Instead, the use of stochastic subgradient descent has been proposed in [12], [48], which takes the following form for $t \geq 1$,

D1. **Primal updates:** At time t, node i observes or estimates $\mathbf{h}_t^i$, and allocates the resources in accordance with:

$$\{x_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t), \mathbf{p}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\} = \underset{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}^i, \mathring{\mathbf{p}}\in\Pi_t^i}{\arg\max}\ f^i(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t, \mathbf{g}_t^i(\mathring{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{x})\rangle \tag{7}$$

D2. **Dual update:** The dual updates at time t take the form:

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1} = \Big[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t - \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{K} \mathbf{g}_t^i(\mathbf{p}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t), \mathbf{x}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t))\Big]^+. \tag{8}$$

Here, $\Pi_t^i := \{\mathbf{p}^i_{\mathbf{h}_t^i} \in \mathbb{R}^p | \mathbf{p}^i \in \mathcal{P}^i\}$ is the set of all legitimate values of the vector $\mathbf{p}^i_{\mathbf{h}_t^i}$. The term $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\mathbf{p}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t), \mathbf{x}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t))$ is a stochastic subgradient of the dual function $D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ at $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$. Further for notational brevity, $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) := \mathbf{g}_t^i(\mathbf{p}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}), \mathbf{x}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}))$ is used at coming places in the paper. The algorithm is initialized with an arbitrary $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1$ and the resulting allocations are asymptotically near optimal and feasible. A constant step-size stochastic gradient descent algorithm is utilized in the dual domain, which not only allows recovery of optimal primal variables via averaging, but also bestows it the ability to handle small changes in the network topology or other problem parameters. The algorithm can be implemented in a distributed fashion in a network with star-topology, with the help of a fusion center (FC). Within the FC-based implementation, the primal iterates are calculated and used locally at each node i. At the end of each time slot, the node i communicates the gradient component $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)$ to the FC, which carries out the dual update (8) and broadcasts $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ to all the nodes in the network.

The stochastic algorithm is preferred over its deterministic counterpart since it does not require Monte Carlo iterations, yields asymptotically near-optimal resource allocations, and is provably convergent if the stochastic process $\{\mathbf{h}_t^i\}$ is stationary. A network implementation of (7)-(8) is however still impractical, owing to its relatively stringent communication requirements. In particular, the algorithm necessitates that each node exchanges messages (i.e. $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$) with the FC at every time-slot, resulting in a large communication cost. Since the updates (7)-(8) must occur before the network state changes, the nodes must synchronize and cooperate in order to meet these deadline constraints, ultimately increasing the message passing overhead and consuming more energy.

Delays may at times be unavoidable in large networks, e.g., due to temporarily poor channel conditions or noise. Nodes in large networks are often heterogeneous, and may not always be able to transmit the gradients within the stipulated time. Finally, if the nodes are not deployed in a star-topology around the FC, the need for multi-hop communications further increases the delays, results in heterogeneous energy consumption, and increases protocol overhead. In all such cases, the FC must wait for the updates to arrive from all the nodes, possibly requiring all the nodes to skip resource allocation for one or more time slots, and resulting in a suboptimal asymptotic objective value.

In summary, the distributed algorithm for solving the stochastic network resource allocation problem should have the following desirable features.

C1. The algorithm should allow nodes to "fall behind" temporarily, e.g., under poor channel conditions and intermittent transmission failures.

C2. The algorithm should allow a distributed implementation, that is, without requiring a star-topology or a FC.

III. Proposed Algorithm

This section details the proposed stochastic dual descent algorithm that overcomes the challenges (C1)-(C2) stated at the end of Sec. II-B. To begin with, Sec. III-A describes the asynchronous variant that tolerates delayed gradients still resulting in near-optimal resource allocation. Next, Sec. III-B details the more general AIS algorithm that is amenable to a distributed implementation.

A. Asynchronous stochastic dual descent

The asynchronous stochastic dual descent algorithm addresses the challenge (C1), and proceeds as follows for all $t \geq 1$:

1) **Primal update**: At each time t, node i solves

$$\{\mathbf{x}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\pi_i(t)}), \mathbf{p}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\pi_i(t)})\} := \underset{\mathbf{x}\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^i, \mathring{\mathbf{p}}\in\Pi_t^i}{\arg\max}\ f^i(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\pi_i(t)}, \mathbf{g}_t^i(\mathring{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{x})\rangle \tag{9}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq K$, and some finite delay $\pi_i(t) \geq 0$.

2) **Dual update**: The dual update at time t is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1} = \left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t - \epsilon \left(\sum_{i=1}^{K} \mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)})\right)\right]^+ \tag{10}$$

the stale gradient, evaluated at time $t - \delta_i(t)$, is given by

$$\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}) := \mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\mathbf{p}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}), \mathbf{x}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}))$$

where the total delay is denoted by $\tau_i(t) := \pi_i(t) + \delta_i(t)$.

For instance, the gradient in Example 1 is given by

$$\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\log(1+h^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}p^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)})) - r^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}) \\ \frac{P_{\max}}{K} - p^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

Different from (7), the resource allocation in (9) utilizes an old dual variable, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\pi_i(t)}$. Further, the dual update is also carried out using an old gradient $\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)})$. The two modes of asynchrony introduced in (9)-(10) allow the primal and dual updates to be carried out at different time scales. In other

words, while the resource allocation at each node still occurs at every time slot, the rate at which the dual variables and the gradients are exchanged may be different. In order to highlight the asynchronous nature of the algorithm, the implementation of (9)-(10) is now described from the perspective of the FC and that of node i, in Algorithms 1 and 2, respectively.

Algorithm 1 : **Operation at FC**

(S0) **Initialize:** $t = 1$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1$, ϵ.
(S1) (Optional) **Update** the dual variable $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ as in (10) using the latest available gradients $\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)})$ for each $1 \leq i \leq K$.
(S2) (Optional) **Broadcasts** the updated $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ to all the nodes.
(S3) (Optional) **Listens** for updated gradients from all the nodes until a time-out.
(S4) $t = t + 1$, go to (S1).

Algorithm 2 : **Operation at node** i

(S0) **Initialize:** $t = 1$.
(S1) **Estimate** the associated random parameter $\mathbf{h}^i_t$.
(S2) **Allocate** resources using the latest available $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\pi_i(t)}$ as in (9).
(S3) (Optional) **Transmits** the gradient $\mathbf{g}^i_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\pi_i(t)})$ to the FC.
(S4) (Optional) **Listens** for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ during the rest of the time slot. Only the latest copy of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ is retained in the memory.
(S5) $t = t + 1$, go to (S1).

Observe that in Algorithms 1 and 2, some steps are 'optional,' which in the present case, means that they can, at times, be skipped. These steps are however still required to be carried out 'often enough', so that the total delay $\tau_i(t)$ is bounded for each node i; cf. (**A4**) in Sec. IV-A. Nevertheless, the optional steps in these algorithms allow the dual updates to occur at a different rate. For instance, as long as each packet is correctly time-stamped, the dual updates at the FC may occur as and when the gradients become available, instead of following a fixed schedule.

The ability to postpone or skip transmissions is important in the context of large heterogeneous networks. For instance, transmissions from the nodes to the FC often requires a multiple access protocol, inter-node coordination, and energy budgeting at each node. Consequently, energy-constrained nodes may extend their lifetime simply by scheduling their transmissions once every few time slots. Similarly, energy harvesting nodes may only transmit when sufficient energy is available, choosing to stay silent in times of energy paucity. The slower nodes may even skip the gradient calculation, as long as the resources are allocated in time.

Finally, the communication between the nodes and the FC may also incur delays, arising from queueing, processing, or retransmission at various layers in the protocol stack. The flexibility of carrying out updates with stale information makes the network tolerant to such delays.

B. Asynchronous Incremental Stochastic Dual Descent

This subsection details an incremental version of the asynchronous algorithm introduced in Sec. III-A, that obviates the need for an FC and overcomes both (C1) and (C2). The AIS dual descent algorithm allows each node to perform the partial dual update itself, while passing messages to nodes along a cycle. Specifically, for a network with a ring topology, such that node i passes dual variable $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i_t$ to node $i+1$ and so on, the primal and dual updates take the following form.



Fig. 1: AIS algorithm operation

1) **Primal update:** At time t, node i solves

$$(\mathbf{x}^i_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\pi_i(t)}), \mathbf{p}^i_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\pi_i(t)})) := \underset{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}^i,\ \mathring{\mathbf{p}}\in\Pi^i_t}{\arg\max}\ f^i(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\pi_i(t)}, \mathbf{g}^i_t(\mathring{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{x})\rangle. \tag{12}$$

2) **Dual update:** At time t, the dual update at node i takes the form

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i_t = \left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_t - \epsilon[\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)})]\right]^+ \tag{13}$$

where,

$$\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)}) := \mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\mathbf{p}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)}), \mathbf{x}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)}))$$

and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0_t$ is read as $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^K_{t-1}$. A key feature of the AIS algorithm is that the message passing and the dual updates occur in parallel with the resource allocation, as shown in Fig. 1. The full implementation details are provided in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 : **At node** i

(S0) **Initialize:** $t = 1, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_1$, ϵ.
(S1) **Estimate** the associated random parameter $\mathbf{h}^i_t$.
(S2) **Allocate** resources using the latest available $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\pi_i(t)}$ as in (12).
(S3) (Optional) **Receive** $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t'}$ and carries out the update (13) using an older gradient $\mathbf{g}^i_{t'-\delta_i(t')}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t'-\tau_i(t')})$.
(S4) (Optional) **Transmit** an updated $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i_{t'}$ to node $i+1$.
(S5) $t = t + 1$, go to (S1).

Here, the two optional steps may be repeated as long as the received $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t'}$ is still old, that is, $t' \leq t$. As in Sec. III-A, the nodes are allowed to halt the updates temporarily, as long as they "catch up," eventually. In other words, the updates for time t' must be carried out before time $t' + \tau$ so as to ensure that $\tau_i(t) \leq \tau$ for all t. Interestingly, although resources are allocated at every time slot, the network may or may not carry out one or more message passing rounds per time-slot. It is remarked that

the update in (13) must still be performed once at every node for each time index t'. Equivalently, the algorithm runs on two 'clocks,' one dictating the resource allocation and synchronous with the changes in the network state, and the other governed by the rate at which messages get passed around the network. In the next section, we will establish that the such an algorithm still converges, as long as the difference between the two clocks is bounded. In summary, the AIS dual descent algorithm has all the benefits of the asynchronous dual descent algorithm of (9)-(10), while allowing a distributed implementation.

As with classical incremental algorithms, the nodes must communicate along a ring topology. Strictly speaking, the message passing overhead is minimized if the updates occur along a Hamilton cycle [29]. Even when the network does not admit a Hamilton cycle, an approximate cycle can be found using a random walk protocol [49] or the protocol described in [29, Sec. VII]. It is remarked that such a route need only be found once, at the start of the algorithm.

IV. Convergence results

This section provides the convergence results for the AIS algorithm. To this end, the assumptions and known results are first stated in Sec. IV-A. The results for the dual case are outlined in Sec. IV-B, while the near-optimality of the resource allocation is established in Sec. IV-C. It is remarked that the results for the asynchronous case follow in a similar manner and are not stated here explicitly.

A. Assumptions and known results

This subsection begins with the discussion of the following general optimization problem:

$$\mathsf{D} = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \sum_{i=1}^{K} D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \tag{14}$$

where, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the optimization variable, $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is closed and convex set, the objective function separates into node-specific cost functions D^i. The goal is to solve (14) using only the stochastic subgradients $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ of $D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ available at node i at time t. Besides the network resource allocation problem considered here, (14) also arises in the context of machine learning [50] and distributed parameter estimation [51]. Before describing the known results related to (14), the necessary assumptions are first stated.

A1. Non-expansive projection mapping. The projection mapping $P_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}[]$ satisfies $\|P_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}[\mathbf{x}] - P_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}[\mathbf{y}]\| \leq \|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|$ for all $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$.

A2. Zero-mean time-invariant error. Given $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, the averaged subgradient function satisfies $\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})]$.

A3. Bounded moments. Given $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, the first and second moments of $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ are bounded as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[\left\|\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right\|] \leq G_i \tag{15}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\left\|\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right\|^2] \leq {V_i}^2. \tag{16}$$

These assumptions are not very restrictive, and hold for most real-world resource allocation problems. A stochastic incremental algorithm for solving (14) was first proposed in [14]. Given a network with ring topology, the updates in [14] take the form

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i = P_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}\left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \epsilon \mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1})\right] \tag{17}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0$ is read as $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-1}^K$. It was shown in [14], that under (**A1**)-(**A3**), the iterates $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i$ are asymptotically near optimal in the following sense

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] \leq \mathsf{D} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \tag{18}$$

Further, for the case when the step size is diminishing, i.e. ϵ_t satisfies $\lim_{T\to\infty}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t \to \infty$ and $\lim_{T\to\infty}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t^2 < \infty$, it holds that

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] \to \mathsf{D}. \tag{19}$$

This paper provides the corresponding results for the asynchronous case, where the subgradient in (17) is replaced by an older copy $\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})$ for some $\tau_i(t) \geq \delta_i(t) \geq 0$. To this end, the following additional assumption regarding the delays $\delta_i(t)$ and $\tau_i(t)$ is stated.

A4. Bounded delay. For each $1 \leq i \leq K$ and $t \geq 1$, it holds that $0 \leq \delta_i(t) \leq \tau_i(t) \leq \tau < \infty$.

The boundedness assumption on the delay is somewhat stringent but not entirely unreasonable. Further, **(A4)** allows us to develop convergence results that hold in the worst case. Alternatively, as in [23], it may be interesting to study the performance of the proposed algorithm on an average, allowing $\delta_i(t)$ and $\tau_i(t)$ to be random variables with unbounded support but finite means. This analysis is however, beyond the scope of the present paper.

The extension to the asynchronous case is not straightforward, since the the old stochastic subgradients are not necessarily descent directions on an average. Indeed, the resulting subgradient error at time t, defined as

$$\mathbf{e}_{t,\delta_i(t)}^i := \left[\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})\right] \tag{20}$$

is neither zero-mean nor i.i.d. In other words, the asynchronous algorithm cannot simply be considered as a special case of the inexact subgradient method.

It is worth pointing out that there is a subtle difference between the definition of the delayed stochastic subgradient considered here, and those considered in [23], [37], [38]. Specifically, the delayed subgradient in these works takes the form $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})$ instead of the one in (20). As a result, given $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}$, the subgradient error at time t in these papers is indeed zero mean and i.i.d., an assumption that simplifies the analysis to a certain extent. It is also remarked that the definition of the delayed stochastic subgradients in [26] is however similar to that considered here. Different from these works, the dual convergence results developed here consider subgradients instead of gradients, and are therefore applicable to a wider range of problems.

Within the context of network resource allocation, it is also important to study the (near-)optimality of the allocations $\{\mathbf{x}_t^i, \mathbf{p}_t^i\}$. Towards this end, some additional assumptions are first stated.

A5. Non-atomic probability density function: The random variables $\{\mathbf{h}_t^i\}_{i=1}^K$ have non-atomic probability density functions (pdf).

A6. Slater's condition: There exists strictly feasible $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K}\mathbf{g}_t^i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t^i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)\right] > 0$.

A7. Lipschitz continuous gradients. Given $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}' \in \boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, there exists $L_i < \infty$ such that

$$\left\|\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) - \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}')\right\| \leq L_i \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}'\right\|. \tag{21}$$

In (**A5**), for $\{\mathbf{h}_t^i\}_{i=1}^K$ to have a non-atomic pdf, it should not have any point masses or delta functions. Note that this requirement is not restrictive for most applications arising in wireless communications; see e.g. [12]. The Slater's condition is a standard assumption that ensures that $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{D} < \infty$. The Lipschitz condition in **(A7)** is however restrictive, since it requires the dual functions $D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ to be differentiable with respect to $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Note however that similar assumptions have been made elsewhere; see e.g. [52]. In other words, with **(A7)**, $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is a stochastic gradient, not a subgradient. Note however that **(A5)**-**(A7)** will not be utilized while establishing the dual convergence results.

The incremental or asynchronous gradient methods have thus far never been applied to the problem of network resource allocation. For the classical stochastic dual descent method (cf. (7)-(8)], it is known that under (**A1**)-(**A3**) and (**A6**), the average resource allocations $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^i := \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathbf{x}_t^i$ are asymptotically feasible and near-optimal [12].

B. Convergence results for the dual case

This subsection provides the convergence results for the AIS algorithm, applied to (14). For the general case, the updates take the following form:

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i = P_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}\left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \epsilon_t \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})\right] \quad 1 \le i \le K \tag{22}$$

where ϵ_t is the step-size, $\mathbf{g}_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is a stochastic subgradient of $D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0$ is read as $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-1}^K$. Since the dual problem (6) is simply a special case of (14), the results developed here also apply to the iterates $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i\}$ generated by Algorithm 1. In order to keep the discussion generic, the results are presented for both, diminishing and constant step sizes.

Theorem 1. *The following results apply to the iterates generated by* (22) *under **(A1)-(A4)**.*

(a) ***Diminishing step-size:*** *If the positive sequence $\{\epsilon_t\}$ satisfies $\lim_{T\to\infty}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t \to \infty$ and $\lim_{T\to\infty}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t^2 < \infty$, then it holds that*

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K}\mathbb{E}\left[D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right]\right] = \mathsf{D}. \tag{23}$$

(b) ***Error bound for constant step size:*** *For $\epsilon_t = \epsilon > 0$, and any arbitrary scalar $\eta > 0$, it holds that*

$$\min_{1\le t\le T}\sum_{i=1}^{K}\mathbb{E}\left[D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] \le \mathsf{D} + \frac{\epsilon C(\tau)+\eta}{2} \tag{24}$$

where $T \le B_0^2/\epsilon\eta$. Here, $C(\tau) := C_1 + (C_2 + \tau C_2')$, $C_1 = KV^2$, $C_2 := 2KVG\frac{K-1}{2}$, $C_2' := 2K^2VG + 2K^2G^2$, and B_0 is such that $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\| \le B_0$.

A popular choice for the diminishing step-size parameter ϵ_t required in Theorem 1(a) is $\epsilon_t = t^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$. For this case, the objective function in (14) converges exactly to the dual optimum. On the other hand, with a constant step size ϵ, the minimum objective value comes to within an $O(\epsilon)$-sized ball around the optimum as $T \to \infty$. More precisely, the result in (24) provides an upper bound on the number of iterations required to come η-close to this ball. Different from the results in [14], the size of the ball now depends on the maximum delay τ, quantifying the worst-case impact of using delayed gradients.

The proof of Theorem 1 follows the same overall structure as in [14], with appropriate modifications introduced to handle the asynchrony. To begin with, the following intermediate lemma splits a function related to the optimality gap in Theorem 1 into three different terms, and develops bounds on each. The proof of the following lemma is provided in Appendix A.

Lemma 1. Under **(A1)**-**(A4)**, the iterates generated by (22) satisfy the following bounds:

$$\sum_{t,i} 2\epsilon_t \mathbb{E}\left[D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] - \mathsf{D} \le B_0^2 + I_0 + I_1 \tag{25}$$

where,

$$I_0 := \sum_t \left(\epsilon_t^2 KV^2 + 2\tau KVG\sum_i \epsilon_t\epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)} + 2VG\sum_i (i-1)\epsilon_t\epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)}\right) \tag{26}$$

$$I_1 := 2\sum_{t,i}\epsilon_t \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}\rangle\right] \le 2\tau KG^2\sum_{t,i}\epsilon_t\epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)}. \tag{27}$$

Having developed the necessary bounds, the proof of Theorem 1 is presented next.

Proof of Theorem 1. For the positive sequence $\{\epsilon_t\}$, it holds that

$$\sum_{t,i} 2\epsilon_t \mathbb{E}\left[D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] \ge \left(\inf_{1\le t\le T}\sum_{i=1}^{K}\mathbb{E}\left[D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right]\right)\sum_{t=1}^{T} 2\epsilon_t.$$

Substituting the bounds obtained in Lemma 1, and noting that it always holds that $\epsilon_t \ge \epsilon_{t-\tau}$ for all $\tau \ge 0$, we obtain

$$\inf_{1\le t\le T}\sum_{i=1}^{K}\mathbb{E}\left[D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] - \mathsf{D} \le \frac{B_0^2 + C_1\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t^2 + (C_2+\tau C_2')\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_{[t-\tau]_+}^2}{2\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t} \tag{28}$$

where, $C_1 := KV^2$, $C_2' := 2K^2VG + 2K^2G^2$ and $C_2 := 2KVG\frac{K-1}{2}$. Note that in (28), we have used the notation $\epsilon_{[t-\tau]_+} := \epsilon_1$ for all $t \le \tau$. Next, for the case when ϵ_t is diminishing, and satisfies $\lim_{T\to\infty}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t \to \infty$ and $\lim_{T\to\infty}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t^2 < \infty$, the numerator of the bound on the right stays bounded, while the denominator grows to infinity. Consequently, taking the limit of $T \to \infty$ on both sides of (28), the required result in (23) follows. When the step size is constant, the bound in (28) can be written as

$$\inf_{1\le t\le T}\sum_{i=1}^{K}\mathbb{E}\left[D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] - \mathsf{D} \le \frac{B_0^2}{2\epsilon T} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}C_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}(C_2+\tau C_2') \tag{29}$$

$$\le \frac{B_0^2}{2\epsilon T} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}C(\tau) \tag{30}$$

where $C(\tau)$ is as defined in Theorem 1. In the limit as $T \to \infty$, the bound becomes

$$\inf_{t\geq 1} \mathbb{E}\left[D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] \leq \mathsf{D} + \frac{\epsilon C(\tau)}{2}. \tag{31}$$

which is the asymptotic version of the result in (24). The proof of the non-asymptotic result in (24) is provided in Appendix D. □

C. Primal near optimality and feasibility

This subsection establishes the average near-optimality of the AIS dual descent algorithm in (12)-(13). Note that Theorem 1 does not imply that the allocations $\{\mathbf{x}_t^i, \mathbf{p}_t^i\}$ converge. Instead, the results will make use of the ergodic limit variable $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_T^i := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_t^i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq K$. The main theorem for this subsection is presented next.

Theorem 2. *Under (A1)-(A7) and for constant step size $\epsilon > 0$, the iterates generated by* (12)-(13) *follow:*

A. **Primal near optimality**

$$\liminf_{T\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}\left[f^i\left(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_T^i\right)\right] \geq \mathsf{P} - \epsilon(C_3 + C_4\tau) \tag{32}$$

where,

$$C_3 = (VGK(K-1) + KV^2)/2$$
$$C_4 = K^2BLG + K^2VG + K^2G^2.$$

B. **Asymptotic feasibility**

$$\liminf_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i,t} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\tau_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)})\right] \succeq 0. \tag{33}$$

Intuitively, the resource allocations in (12) are near-optimal, with optimality gap depending on the step size ϵ and the delay bound τ. Further, the allocations are almost surely asymptotically feasible, regardless of the the delay bound or the step size. As in Sec. IV-B, the proof of Theorem 2 proceeds by first splitting the optimality gap into three terms and developing bounds on each. The required results are summarized into the following intermediate Lemmas, whose proofs are deferred to Appendices B and C respectively.

Lemma 2. The iterates $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i$ obtained from (13) are bounded on an average, i.e., there exists $B < \infty$ such that $\mathbb{E}\,\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t\| \leq B$ for all $t \geq 1$.

Lemma 3. Under **(A1)-(A4)**, the iterates generated by (12)-(13) satisfy the following bounds:

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}\left[f^i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_T^i)\right] \geq \mathsf{D} - I_2 - I_3 \tag{34}$$

where,

$$I_2 := \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t,i} \mathbb{E}\left[D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] \leq \epsilon VGK(K-1)/2$$

$$I_3 := \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t,i} \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1})\rangle\right] \leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1\|^2}{2\epsilon T} + \frac{\epsilon KV^2}{2} + I_4$$

$$I_4 := \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t,i} \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, (\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)})\rangle\right]$$
$$\leq \epsilon\tau K^2 G(BL + V + G).$$

Having established the intermediate results, the proof of Theorem 2 is now presented.

Proof of Theorem 2. The primal near-optimality can be established directly from Lemma 3. Specifically, summing the bounds for I_2, I_3, and I_4, and taking the limit as $T \to \infty$, the bound in (32) follows.

In order to establish (33), observe that for any $t \geq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq K$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i &= \left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \epsilon \mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)})\right]^+ \\ &\succeq \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \epsilon \mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)})\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where the inequality holds element-wise. Summing both sides over all $1 \leq t \leq T$ and $1 \leq i \leq K$, and rearranging, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{i,t} \mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)}) \succeq \frac{1}{\epsilon T}\sum_{t,i}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i) \succeq \frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^K - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1}^K}{\epsilon T}.$$

Finally, since $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^K \succeq 0$ and from 2, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{i,t} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)})\right] \succeq -\frac{B}{\epsilon T} \tag{36}$$

where (36) holds due to Lemma 2. In other words, given any $\alpha > 0$, there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $T \geq t_0$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{i,t} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}^i_{t-\delta_i(t)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1}_{t-\tau_i(t)})\right] \geq -\alpha. \tag{37}$$

Taking the limit as $T \to \infty$, the result in (33) follows. □

V. Application to co-ordinated beamforming

This section considers the co-ordinated downlink beamforming problem in wireless communication networks. The usefulness of the proposed stochastic incremental algorithm is demonstrated by applying it to the beamforming problem and solving it in a distributed and online fashion. Simulations are carried out to confirm that the performance of the proposed algorithm is close to that of the centralized algorithm.

A. Problem formulation

Consider a multi-cell multi-user wireless network with B base stations and U users. Each user $j \in \{1, \ldots, U\}$ is associated with a single base station $b(j) \in \{1, \ldots, B\}$, and the set of users associated with a base station i is denoted by $\mathcal{U}_i := \{j | b(j) = i\}$. For the sake of consistency, this section will utilize indices i and m for base stations, and indices j, k, and n for users, with the additional restriction that $b(j) = b(k) = i$ and $b(n) = m$. Within the downlink scenario considered here, user j can only receive data symbols $s_j \in \mathbb{C}$ from its associated base station $b(j)$. The signals transmitted by the base station i intended for other users $k \in \mathcal{U}_i \setminus \{j\}$, as well as the signals transmitted by other base stations $m \neq i$ constitute, respectively, the intra-cell and inter-cell interference at user j. The base station i, equipped with N_i transmit antennas, utilizes the transmit beamforming vector $\mathbf{w}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times 1}$ for each of its associated user $j \in \mathcal{U}_i$. Consequently, the received signal at user j is given by

$$y_j = \mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \left(\mathbf{w}_j s_j + \sum_{k\in\mathcal{U}_i\setminus\{j\}} \mathbf{w}_k s_k\right) + \sum_{\substack{m\neq i \\ n\in\mathcal{U}_m}} \mathbf{h}_{mj}^H \mathbf{w}_n s_n + e_j$$

where $\mathbf{h}_{ij}$ denotes the complex channel gain vector between base station i and user j, and e_j is the zero mean, complex Gaussian random variable with variance σ^2 that models the noise at user j. Assuming s_k to be independent, zero-mean, and with unit variance, the expression for the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) at user j is given by

$$\text{SINR}_j := \frac{\left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_j\right|^2}{\sum\limits_{k\in\mathcal{U}_i\setminus\{j\}} \left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_k\right|^2 + \sum\limits_{m\neq i}\sum\limits_{n\in\mathcal{U}_m} \left|\mathbf{h}_{mj}^H \mathbf{w}_n\right|^2 + \sigma^2} \tag{38}$$

where $i = b(j)$ is the associated base station.

Within the classical co-ordinated beamforming framework, the goal is to design the beamformers $\{\mathbf{w}_j\}_{j=1}^U$ so as to minimize the transmit power, while meeting the SINR constraints at each user. The required optimization problem becomes [53]

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{w}_j\}_{j=1}^U} \sum_{j=1}^U \|\mathbf{w}_j\|^2 \quad \text{subject to } \text{SINR}_j \geq \gamma_j \quad \forall\ j \tag{39}$$

where γ_j is a pre-specified quality-of-service (QoS) threshold for user j. While the beamforming vectors resulting from (39) are optimal, the centralized nature of the optimization problem renders it impractical for application to real networks. For instance, the solution proposed in [53] requires the estimated channel gains $\{\mathbf{h}_{ij}\}$ to be collected at a centralized location, where (39) is solved via an iterative algorithm. In practice however, the entire parameter exchange and the algorithm must complete within a fraction of the coherence time of the channel, lest the designed beamformer becomes obsolete. Such a solution is therefore difficult to implement, not robust to node or link failures, and not scalable to large networks.

Observe that the modified version of (39) can be written as

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{w}_j, I_{nj}\}} \sum_{j=1}^U \|\mathbf{w}_j\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \tag{40a}$$

$$\frac{\left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_j\right|^2}{\sum\limits_{k\in\mathcal{U}_i\setminus\{j\}} \left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_k\right|^2 + I_j^2 + \sigma^2} \geq \gamma_j \qquad \forall\ j \tag{40b}$$

$$\sum_{m\neq i}\sum_{n\in\mathcal{U}_m} \left|\mathbf{h}_{mj}^H \mathbf{w}_n\right| \leq I_j \qquad \forall\ j \tag{40c}$$

where $i = b(j)$. Note that constraints in (40b) and (40c) will ensure the SINR is still greater than the required threshold of γ_j. It is due to the fact that the feasible set is restricted and feasible set of (40) will be subset of that of (39) and solution found for (40) can be used for (39). Next, the use of primal or dual decomposition techniques can yield a distributed algorithm for (40). Nevertheless, such distributed algorithms also suffer from the limitations mentioned earlier, since the optimum beamforming vectors are required at every time slot.

On the other hand, within the uncoordinated beamforming framework, the optimization variable I_j in (40) is replaced with a pre-specified threshold ρ. This renders (40) separable at each base station, allowing beamforming vectors to be designed in parallel. However, the resulting beamformers are suboptimal, and may even render the problem infeasible if ρ is too small or too large.

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{w}_j, I_{nj}\}} \sum_{j=1}^U \|\mathbf{w}_j\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \tag{41a}$$

$$\frac{\left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_j\right|^2}{\sum\limits_{k\in\mathcal{U}_i\setminus\{j\}} \left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_k\right|^2 + \rho^2 \sum\limits_{m\neq i} card(\mathcal{U}_m) + \sigma^2} \geq \gamma_j \quad ; \quad \forall\ j \tag{41b}$$

$$\left|\mathbf{h}_{mj}^H \mathbf{w}_n(t)\right| \leq \rho \qquad m\neq i, n\in U_m, \forall\ j. \tag{41c}$$

A compromise is possible within the stochastic optimization framework by requiring the bound in (40c) to only be satisfied on an average. Note that this amounts to relaxing the optimization problem (40) since the SINR constraint is no longer binding at every time slot. The overall stochastic optimization problem can be expressed as

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{w}_j(t), I_{nj}(t)\}} \sum_{j=1}^U \|\mathbf{w}_j(t)\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \tag{42a}$$

$$\frac{\left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_j(t)\right|^2}{\sum\limits_{k\in\mathcal{U}_i\setminus\{j\}} \left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_k(t)\right|^2 + I_j^2(t) + \sigma^2} \geq \gamma_j \qquad \forall\ j \tag{42b}$$

$$\sum_{m\neq i}\sum_{n\in\mathcal{U}_m} \mathbb{E}\left|\mathbf{h}_{mj}^H \mathbf{w}_n(t)\right| \leq \mathbb{E}\left[I_j(t)\right] \qquad \forall\ j \tag{42c}$$

$$\left|\mathbf{h}_{mj}^H \mathbf{w}_n(t)\right| \leq \rho \qquad m\neq i, n\in U_m, \forall\ j \tag{42d}$$

where $i = b(j)$. Different from (39) or (40), the stochastic optimization problem (42) involves finding policies $\mathbf{w}_j(t)$ and $I_j(t)$, which are not necessarily optimal for every time slot t, but only on an average. Specifically, the intercell interference is bounded on an average [cf. (42c)], but also instantaneously [cf. (42d)], so as to limit the worst case SINR. The problem in (42) can be readily implemented using the proposed distributed and asynchronous stochastic dual descent algorithm. In contrast to (40), the stochastic algorithm is not required to converge at every time slot, and allows cooperation over heterogeneous nodes.

B. Solution to optimization problem

The AIS algorithm proposed in Sec. III-B can now be applied to solve (42). To this end, associate dual variables λ_j for all users $\{j \in [1, U]\}$, and observe that the primal variables at node i include $\{\mathbf{w}_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{U}_i}$ and $\{I_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{U}_i}$. Departing from the notational convention used thus far, the subscript in λ_j is used for indexing the users, while time dependence is indicated by $\lambda_j(t)$. Proceeding as in Sec. III-B, and recalling that the indices j and n are such that $i = b(j) \neq b(n) = m$, the operation at node i is summarized in Algo. 4. Observe that such an implementation entails allocating resources prior to the dual updates, and thus results in the delay of at least one, i.e., $\pi_i(t) \geq 1$, compared to the synchronous version. Conversely, the dual updates occur as and when they are passed around, without creating a bottleneck for the resource allocation. For the sake of simplicity, it is assumed that the dual updates occur along the route 1, 2, ..., K.

Next, simulations are carried out demonstrate the applicability of the stochastic algorithm to the beamforming problem at hand. For the simulations, we consider a system with $B = 10$ and

Algorithm 4 :Operation at node i

1: **Set** $t=1$, initialize $\lambda_j^0(1)$

2: **Beamformer design:** At the start of time instant t, given old dual variables $\{\lambda_j^i(t-\pi_i(t))\}$

$$\{\mathbf{w}_j(t), I_j(t)\}_{\{\forall j|i=b(j)\}} := \tag{43}$$
$$\arg\min_{\mathbf{w},I} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{U}_i}\left[\|\mathbf{w}_j\|^2 - \lambda_j^i(t-\pi_i(t))I_j\right]$$
$$+\sum_{j\notin\mathcal{U}_i}\left[\lambda_j^i(t-\pi_i(t))\left(\sum_{n\in\mathcal{U}_i}\left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}^H\mathbf{w}_n\right|\right)\right]$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad (42b), (42d)$$

3: **(Optional) Receive :** $\{\lambda_j^i(t')\}_{\forall j}$, where $t'\le t$

4: **Dual update:** To complete cycle t', for all j

- If $b(j)=i$, then
$$\lambda_j^{i+1}(t') = \left[\lambda_j^i(t') - \epsilon I_j(t-\delta_i(t))\right]^+$$
- If $b(j)\neq i$, then
$$\lambda_j^{i+1}(t') = \left[\lambda_j^i(t') + \epsilon\left(\sum_{n\in\mathcal{U}_i}\left|\mathbf{h}_{ij}(t-\delta_i(t))^H\mathbf{w}_n(t-\delta_i(t))\right|\right)\right.$$

where, $\lambda_j^1(t'+1)=\lambda_j^{B+1}(t')$ for all j

5: **Set** $t=t+1$, go to step 2

$U=10$, with one users per cell. Each of the base stations have ten antennas ($N_1=N_2=10$), while the other algorithm parameters are $\epsilon=0.5$, $\sigma^2=1$, $\rho=1.65$ $\gamma_j=10$ dB for all j. In order to keep the simulations realistic, we assume that the delays in the dual updates arise from random events such as node and link failures. For the centralized algorithm, a random subset of four out of ten nodes are selected to transmit their current gradients to the FC at every time slot. Since the FC utilizes old gradients for the other nodes, it results in an average delay of 5.4 time slots. Similarly, for the incremental algorithm, it is assumed that at every time slots, five to fifteen dual update steps (cf. (8)) occur, also resulting in an average delay of 5.4 time slots. Fig. 2 shows the running average of the primal objective function as a function of time using Monte Carlo simulations. For comparison, the performance of the classical centralized stochastic subgradient method [cf. (7)-(8)], assuming perfect message passing, is also shown. As evident, the performance loss due to the delays in the availability of the dual variables in minimal.

In order to motivate the stochastic formulation over the deterministic one, Fig. 3 also compares the average transmit power and SINR achieved for the various cases and for different values of the parameter ρ. As expected, the distributed deterministic algorithm performs poorly since it forces the SINR bound to be a constant that does not depend on the channel. By design, the worst case SINR is bounded below by one at every time slot in both the deterministic formulations. Interestingly, the worst case SINR achieved for the relaxed stochastic formulation is also close to one on an average. In return, the stochastic algorithm yields an average transmit power that is equal to or below that obtained



Fig. 2: Primal objective function against time $t(B=10)$



Fig. 3: Transmitted power and SINR against ρ

by the centralized deterministic formulation. In other words, it is always possible to artificially raise γ to a value that is slightly higher than one, so as to obtain an average SINR above 10 dB, while still getting near-optimal average transmit power.

VI. Conclusion

This paper considers a constrained stochastic resource allocation problem over a heterogeneous network. An asynchronous incremental stochastic dual descent method is proposed for solving the same. The proposed algorithm utilizes delayed gradients for carrying out the updates, resulting in an attractive feature that allows nodes to skip or postpone some updates. The convergence of the proposed algorithm is established for both constant and diminishing step sizes. Further, it is shown that the resource allocations arising from the proposed algorithm are also asymptotically near-optimal. A novel multi-cell coordinated beamforming problem is formulated within the stochastic framework considered here, and solved via the proposed algorithm. Simulation results reveal the the impact of using stale stochastic gradients is minimal.

Appendix A
Proof of Lemma 1

1) Preliminaries: Before deriving the required bounds, the following general result is first derived. For the sake of convenience, we denote $\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i := \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})$. From the updates in (22), it holds for all t and $1\le i\le K$ that

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}\right\| = \mathbb{E}\left\|P_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}\left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \epsilon_t\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right] - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}\right\|$$
$$\le \epsilon_t\mathbb{E}\left\|\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right\| \le \epsilon_t G_i \tag{44}$$

where the inequalities in (44) follow from (**A1**) and (**A3**). Given $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and $t \geq t' \geq 1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t'}^j\right\| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{i} \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^k - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{k-1}\right\| \\
&+ \sum_{s=t'+1}^{t-1}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_s^k - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_s^{k-1}\right\| + \sum_{k=j+1}^{K} \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t'}^k - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t'}^{k-1}\right\| \\
&\leq \epsilon_t \sum_{k=1}^{i} G_k + \left(\sum_{s=t'+1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s\right)\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} G_k\right) + \epsilon_{t'} \sum_{k=j+1}^{K} G_k \\
&\leq \epsilon_t (iG) + \left(\sum_{s=t'+1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s\right)(KG) + \epsilon_{t'}(K-j)G \qquad (45) \\
&\leq \epsilon_{t'}\left[|i-j|\, G + KG(t-t')\right]. \qquad (46)
\end{aligned}$$

where (45) is obtained by substituting $G = \max_i G_i$ and (46) follows since $\epsilon_{t'} \geq \epsilon_s$ for all $t' \leq s \leq t$. Further, for $t \geq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq K$, let $\mathcal{F}_t^i$ be the σ-algebra generated by the random variables

$$\{\mathbf{g}_1^1, \ldots, \mathbf{g}_1^K, \mathbf{g}_2^1 \ldots, \mathbf{g}_{t-1}^K, \mathbf{g}_t^1, \ldots, \mathbf{g}_t^i\}. \qquad (47)$$

With this definition, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}\right] = \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}) \qquad (48)$$

since $\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i$ may depend on $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_s^{i-1}$ only for $s \leq t - \delta_i(t)$.

Proof: The proof is organized into two parts. Subsection A-2 develops a bound on the optimality gap in (25), in terms of I_1. Subsequently, Subsection A-3 develops the required bound on I_1.

2) Bound on the optimality gap: Observe from the updates in (22) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 &= \left\|P_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}\left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \epsilon_t \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right] - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 \\
&\leq \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \epsilon_t \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 \qquad (49) \\
&= \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 - 2\epsilon_t \langle \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\rangle + \epsilon_t^2 \left\|\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right\|^2 \\
&= \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 - 2\epsilon_t \langle \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\rangle \\
&+ \epsilon_t^2 \left\|\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right\|^2 - 2\epsilon_t \langle \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}\rangle \qquad (50)
\end{aligned}$$

where (49) follows form (**A1**), and the term $2\epsilon_t \langle \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}\rangle$ has been added and subtracted to obtain (50). Taking expectations on both sides and summing over all $1 \leq i \leq K$ and $1 \leq t \leq T$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_T^K - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 + \sum_{t,i} \epsilon_t^2 \mathbb{E}\left\|\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right\|^2 + I_1 \\
&- 2\sum_{t,i} \epsilon_t \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\rangle\right] \qquad (51)
\end{aligned}$$

where I_1 is as defined in Lemma 1. Deferring the bound on I_1 to Subsection A-3, the last term in (51) is analyzed first. In particular, it holds from (48) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\rangle\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}\right], \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\rangle\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\rangle\right]. \qquad (52)
\end{aligned}$$

Further, since the functions $D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ are convex, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\langle \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\rangle \leq D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}) \\
&= D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) + D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}) \qquad (53) \\
&\leq D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) + \langle \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}\rangle \qquad (54) \\
&\leq D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) + V_i \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}\right\| \qquad (55)
\end{aligned}$$

where (53)-(54) follow from the first order convexity condition for D^i and (55) follows from the use of triangle inequality, and the fact that given any $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \boldsymbol{\Lambda}$,

$$\left\|\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right\| = \left\|\mathbb{E} g_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right\| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left\|g_t^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right\|^2} \leq V_i. \qquad (56)$$

For the last term in (55), taking expectation and utilizing the result in (46), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}\right\| \leq \epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)}\left[(i-1)G + KG(\tau_i(t))\right] \qquad (57)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq K$. Finally, substituting (55), (57) in (51), and using (**A3**), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_T^K - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 &\leq \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 + \sum_{t,i} \epsilon_t^2 V_i^2 + I_1 \\
&- 2\sum_{t,i} \epsilon_t \left[\mathbb{E} D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star)\right] \\
&+ 2\sum_{t,i} \epsilon_t \epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)} V_i \left[(i-1)G + KG(\tau_i(t))\right]. \qquad (58)
\end{aligned}$$

Since the left-hand side is non-negative and $\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 \leq B_0^2$, the first part of Lemma 1 is obtained simply by rearranging the terms in (58)

$$\begin{aligned}
2\sum_{t,i} \epsilon_t \left[\mathbb{E} D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star)\right] &\leq B_0^2 + I_1 \\
&+ \sum_{t,i} \left(\epsilon_t^2 V_i^2 + 2\epsilon_t \epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)} V_i \left[(i-1)G + \tau KG\right]\right) \qquad (59) \\
&\leq B_0^2 + I_0 + I_1 \qquad (60)
\end{aligned}$$

where (59) follows since $\tau_i(t) \leq \tau$, and ϵ_t is non-increasing sequence. Finally, (60) follows from substituting $V_i \leq V$ for all $1 \leq i \leq K$, and I_0 is as defined in Lemma 1.

3) Bound on I_1: In order to derive a bound on I_1, we make use of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}\rangle\right] &\leq G_i \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}\right\| \\
&\leq \tau_i(t) \epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)} G_i KG \qquad (61)
\end{aligned}$$

where (61) follows from (46). Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq \sum_{t,i} 2\epsilon_t \epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)} \tau_i(t) G_i KG \qquad (62) \\
&\leq 2\tau KG \sum_{t,i} G_i \epsilon_t \epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)} \qquad (63)
\end{aligned}$$

where (63) utilizes the bounds $\tau_i(t) \leq \tau$. Finally, substituting $G = \max_i G_i$, we obtain

$$I_1 \leq 2\tau KG^2 \sum_{t,i} \epsilon_t \epsilon_{t-\tau_i(t)} \qquad (64)$$

which is the required bound. ∎

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF LEMMA 2

In this section, the following bound on the dual iterates will be derived in order to establish Lemma 2:

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^K\right\| \leq 2\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\| + \max\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^0\right\|, \frac{\theta}{C}\left[\mathsf{D} - \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}\left[f^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)\right]\right] + \frac{\epsilon\theta K V^2}{2C} + \frac{2\theta\epsilon\tau\bar{G}}{C} + \epsilon G K\right\} \tag{65}$$

where θ and C are positive constants, and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i\}$ is a Slater point of (1).

Proof: We begin with substituting $\epsilon_t = \epsilon$, and $V = \max_i V_i$, and using (**A4**) into (58), to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^K - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 - 2\epsilon\left[\mathbb{E}D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) - \mathsf{D} - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\tilde{G} - \epsilon\tau\bar{G}\right] \tag{66}$$

where $\tilde{G} := GVK(K-1)$ and $\bar{G} := K^2G^2 + K^2GV$. The rest of the proof follows via induction. Observe that (73) holds trivially for $t = 1$. Assuming that the relationship holds for $t-1$, it remains to show that it also holds for time instant t. We split the argument into the following two cases.

Case 1. $\mathbb{E}D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) > \mathsf{D} + \epsilon\tilde{G}/2 + \epsilon\tau\bar{G}$*:* In this case, it holds that $\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^K - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2$. Consequently, the induction hypothesis for time $t-1$ implies that (73) also holds for time t.

Case 2. $\mathbb{E}D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) \leq \mathsf{D} + \epsilon\tilde{G}/2 + \epsilon\tau\bar{G}$*:* Recall that the dual function in (5) is defined as

$$D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) = \max_{\mathbf{x}^i\in\mathcal{X},\ \mathbf{p}_t^i\in\mathcal{P}_t} \sum_{i=1}^K \left[f^i(\mathbf{x}^i) + \langle\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0, \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}_t^i(\mathbf{p}_t^i, \mathbf{x}^i)\right]\rangle\right] \geq \sum_{i=1}^K \left[f^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i) + \langle\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0, \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}_t^i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t^i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)\right]\rangle\right] \tag{67}$$

where $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i, \{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t^i\}_{t\geq 1}\}_{i=1}^K$ is a strictly feasible (Slater) solution to (1). From (**A6**), such a strictly feasible solution exists and satisfies $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}_t^i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t^i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)\right] > C > 0$. Substituting into (67), and rearranging, we obtain

$$\langle\mathbf{1}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0\rangle \leq \frac{1}{C}\left[D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0) - \sum_{i=1}^K f^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)\right] \tag{68}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0 \succeq 0$, it follows from equivalence of norms that for any norm, $\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0\right\| \leq \theta\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0\right\|_1 = \theta\langle\mathbf{1}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0\rangle$. Therefore, taking expectations in (68) yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0\right\| \leq \frac{\theta}{C}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0)\right] - \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}f^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)\right] \tag{69}$$

$$\leq \frac{\theta}{C}\left[\mathsf{D} + \epsilon\tilde{G}/2 + \epsilon\tau\bar{G} - \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}f^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)\right] \tag{70}$$

where the assumption for Case 2 has been used in (70). Finally, the use of triangle inequality and the bound in (46) yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^K - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\| \leq \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0\right\| + \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^K - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0\right\| + \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\| \tag{71}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0\right\| + \epsilon G K + \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\| \tag{72}$$

which, together with (70), yields (73).

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^K - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\| \leq \max\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^0 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|, \frac{\theta}{C}\left[\mathsf{D} - \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}\left[f^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)\right]\right] + \frac{\epsilon\theta K V^2}{2C} + \frac{2\theta\epsilon\tau\bar{G}}{C} + \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\| + \epsilon G K\right\} \tag{73}$$

Finally, using (73) and triangle inequality, we obtain the result in (65). ∎

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Proof: First observe that, since the functions f^i are concave, the expected value of the primal objective can be written as

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^K f^i\left(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^i\right)\right] \geq \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t,i} f^i(\mathbf{x}_t^i)\right] \tag{74}$$

$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t,i}\mathbb{E}\left[f^i(\mathbf{x}_t^i) + \langle\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1})\rangle - \langle\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1})\rangle\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t,i}\mathbb{E}D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t,i}\mathbb{E}\langle\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1})\rangle \tag{75}$$

$$= \mathsf{D} - I_2 - I_3 \tag{76}$$

where I_2 and I_3 are as defined in Lemma 3. The rest of the proof proceeds simply be developing bounds on I_2 and I_3.

1) Bound on I_2: We begin with the following observation

$$\sum_{i=1}^K D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^K D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) + D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^K D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t) + \sum_{i=1}^K (D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)) \geq \mathsf{D} + \sum_{i=1}^K (D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)) \tag{77}$$

where (77) follows since $\mathsf{D} = \sum_{i=1}^K D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star) \leq \sum_{i=1}^K D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ for all $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \boldsymbol{\Lambda}$. Since the functions D^i are convex, it holds that

$$D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t) \geq \langle\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t\rangle \tag{78}$$

$$\geq -\left\|\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right\|\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t\right\| \tag{79}$$

$$\geq -V_i\epsilon(i-1)G \tag{80}$$

where (79) uses the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, while (80) uses (46) and (56). Therefore, substituting (80) into (77) and rearranging, we obtain

$$I_2 \leq \epsilon G\sum_{i=1}^K (i-1)V_i. \tag{81}$$

Finally, the required bound in Lemma 3 is obtained by substituting $V = \max_i V_i$.

2) Bound on I_3: Using the update in (13) and expanding as in (49), since $\mathbf{0} \in \Lambda$ we obtain

$$\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i\right\|^2 \leq \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}\right\|^2 + \left\|\epsilon\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right\|^2 - 2\epsilon\langle\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\rangle. \tag{82}$$

Adding the term $2\epsilon\langle\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1})\rangle$ on both sides, and rearranging, we obtain

$$2\epsilon\langle\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1})\rangle \leq \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}\right\|^2 - \left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i\right\|^2 + \left\|\epsilon\mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right\|^2$$

$$- 2\epsilon\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \mathbf{e}_{t,\delta_i(t)}^i \rangle \tag{83}$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{t,\delta_i(t)}^i$ is as defined in (20). Summing over $i = 1, \ldots, K$ and $t = 1, \cdots, T$, taking expectation, and utilizing (**A3**), it follows that

$$I_3 \leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1\|^2}{2\epsilon T} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\sum_{i=1}^K V_i^2 + I_4 \tag{84}$$

$$\leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1\|^2}{2\epsilon T} + \frac{\epsilon K V^2}{2} + I_4 \tag{85}$$

where I_4 is as defined in Lemma 3 and the (85) uses $V = \max_i V_i$.

3) Bound on I_4: Adding and subtracting $\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})\rangle$ to each summand of I_4, we obtain

$$I_4 = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{i,t}\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})\rangle\right] + \sum_{i,t}\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\rangle\right]. \tag{86}$$

Of these, the first term can be bounded using the bound in Lemma 2 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, by observing that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}, \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})\rangle\right] \leq B\mathbb{E}\left\|\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}) - \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1})\right\| \tag{87}$$

$$\leq BL^i\mathbb{E}\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\tau_i(t)}^{i-1}\right\| \tag{88}$$

$$\leq BL^i\epsilon\tau KG \tag{89}$$

where (88) follows from (**A7**) and (89) from the bound developed in (46).

For the second term, recalling the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}$ from Appendix A, observe that although $\mathbb{E}\left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}\right] \neq \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^i$, there exists some $\kappa_i(t) \leq t$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\kappa_i(t)}^{i-1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}\right] = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\kappa_i(t)}^{i-1}. \tag{90}$$

Indeed, observe that $\kappa_i(t) \geq t - \delta_i(t)$ since $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}$ only depends on random variables contained in $\mathcal{F}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}\rangle\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1}\rangle \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}\right]\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\kappa_i(t)}^{i-1}\rangle \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}\right]\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\kappa_i(t)}^{i-1}\rangle\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

From (48) and (90), it follows that the first summand in (91) is zero. The second summand can be bounded by using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the bounds in (**A4**) and (46) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\kappa_i(t)}^{i-1}\rangle\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\nabla D^i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^{i-1}) - \mathbf{g}_{t-\delta_i(t)}^i\right\|\right]\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\kappa_i(t)}^{i-1}\right\|\right] \\
&\leq \epsilon(V_i + G_i)(t - \kappa_i(t))KG \qquad (92) \\
&\leq \epsilon(V_i + G_i)\tau KG \qquad (93)
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in (93) follows since $t - \tau_i(t) \leq t - \delta_i(t) \leq \kappa_i(t) \leq t$. Finally, substituting (93) and (89) into (86) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^K \epsilon\tau KG(BL^i + V_i + G_i) \\
&\leq \epsilon\tau K^2 G(BL + V + G)
\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

which together with (85) gives the desired bound. ∎

Appendix D
Proof of (24)

Proof: The proof builds upon a similar result from [54, Prop. 3.3]. Given arbitrary $\eta > 0$ and recalling that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t := \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t^0$, define the sequence

$$\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{t+1} := \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1} \ ; \ \text{if} \ \ \mathbb{E}\left[D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)\right] \geq \mathsf{D} + \frac{\epsilon C(\tau) + \eta}{2} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star \ ; \ \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{95}$$

In other words, $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t$ is same as $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ until $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ enters level set defined as

$$L = \left\{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda \mid \mathbb{E}\left[D(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right] < \mathsf{D} + \frac{\epsilon C(\tau) + \eta}{2}\right\} \tag{96}$$

and $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t$ terminates at $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star$. From (58) and Lemma 1, we have for constant step size $\epsilon_t = \epsilon$ that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{t+1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2\right] - 2\epsilon\left[\mathbb{E}\left[D(\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t) - \mathsf{D}\right]\right] + \epsilon^2 C(\tau) \tag{97}$$

where $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{t+1} := \mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t^K$ and $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t = \mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t^0$. Next define

$$z_t := \begin{cases} 2\epsilon\left[\mathbb{E}\left[D(\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t) - \mathsf{D}\right]\right] - \epsilon^2 C(\tau) \ \ \text{if} \ \ \mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t \notin L \\ 0 \ \ \text{if} \ \ \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{98}$$

so that (97) can be written as

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{t+1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2\right] - z_t. \tag{99}$$

From the Monotone convergence theorem, we have that $\sum_{t=1}^\infty z_t < \infty$, implying that there exists $T < \infty$, such that $z_t = 0$ for all $t \geq T$. Observe that for the case when $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t \notin L$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
z_t &= 2\epsilon\left[\mathbb{E}\left[D(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t) - \mathsf{D}\right]\right] - \epsilon^2 C(\tau) \qquad (100) \\
&\geq 2\epsilon\left[\mathsf{D} + \frac{\epsilon C(\tau) + \eta}{2} - \mathsf{D}\right] - \epsilon^2 C(\tau) \qquad (101) \\
&\geq \epsilon\eta. \qquad (102)
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it follows from (99) that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{T+1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathring{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\right\|^2\right] - \sum_{t=1}^T z_t. \tag{103}$$

Since the term on the left is non-negative, we have that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\star\|^2 \geq \sum_{t=1}^\infty z_t = \sum_{t=1}^T z_t \geq T\epsilon\eta \tag{104}$$

yielding the required bound on T. ∎

REFERENCES

[1] Y.-W. Hong, W.-J. Huang, F.-H. Chiu, and C.-C. J. Kuo, "Cooperative communications in resource-constrained wireless networks," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 47–57, 2007.

[2] A. K. Sadek, W. Su, and K. Liu, "Multinode cooperative communications in wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 341–355, 2007.

[3] L. Georgiadis, M. J. Neely, and L. Tassiulas, "Resource allocation and cross-layer control in wireless networks," *Found. Trends. Network.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–144, 2006.

[4] Z. Han and K. R. Liu, *Resource allocation for wireless networks: basics, techniques, and applications*. Cambridge university press, 2008.

[5] N. Gatsis and G. B. Giannakis, "Residential load control: Distributed scheduling and convergence with lost ami messages," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 770–786, 2012.

[6] Z. Fan, P. Kulkarni, S. Gormus, C. Efthymiou, G. Kalogridis, M. Sooriyabandara, Z. Zhu, S. Lambotharan, and W. H. Chin, "Smart grid communications: overview of research challenges, solutions, and standardization activities," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 21–38, 2013.

[7] R. Afolabi, A. Dadlani, and K. Kim, "Multicast Scheduling and Resource Allocation Algorithms for OFDMA-Based Systems: A Survey," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 240–254, First 2013.

[8] J. Jaramillo and R. Srikant, "Optimal scheduling for fair resource allocation in ad hoc networks with elastic and inelastic traffic," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 1125–1136, Aug 2011.

[9] S. Alaei, M. Hajiaghayi, and V. Liaghat, "The Online Stochastic Generalized Assignment Problem," in *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, vol. 8096, pp. 11–25.

[10] X. Wang and N. Gao, "Stochastic resource allocation over fading multiple access and broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2382–2391, 2010.

[11] A. Ribeiro and G. B. Giannakis, "Separation principles in wireless networking," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4488–05, 2010.

[12] A. Ribeiro, "Ergodic Stochastic Optimization Algorithms for Wireless Communication and Networking," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 6369–6386, Dec. 2010.

[13] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Approximate primal solutions and rate analysis for dual subgradient methods," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 1757–1780, 2009.

[14] S. S. Ram, A. Nedi, and V. V. Veeravalli, "Incremental stochastic subgradient algorithms for convex optimization," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 691–717, 2009.

[15] A. Nedić, D. P. Bertsekas, and V. S. Borkar, "Distributed asynchronous incremental subgradient methods," *Stud. Comput. Math.*, vol. 8, pp. 381–407, 2001.

[16] T.-H. Chang, M. Hong, W.-C. Liao, and X. Wang, "Asynchronous distributed admm for large-scale optimization-part i: Algorithm and convergence analysis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02597*, 2015.

[17] R. Zhang and J. Kwok, "Asynchronous distributed admm for consensus optimization," in *Proc. of the 31st Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, 2014, pp. 1701–1709.

[18] E. Wei and A. Ozdaglar, "On the o (1/k) convergence of asynchronous distributed alternating direction method of multipliers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.8254*, 2013.

[19] K. Srivastava and A. Nedić, "Distributed asynchronous constrained stochastic optimization," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 772–790, 2011.

[20] A. Nedić, "Asynchronous broadcast-based convex optimization over a network," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 1337–51, 2011.

[21] S. S. Ram, A. Nedić, and V. V. Veeravalli, "Asynchronous gossip algorithms for stochastic optimization," in *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*. Shanghai, China: IEEE, 2009, pp. 3581–3586.

[22] K. Rajawat, N. Gatsis, and G. B. Giannakis, "Cross-layer designs in coded wireless fading networks with multicast," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 1276–1289, 2011.

[23] A. Agarwal and J. C. Duchi, "Distributed delayed stochastic optimization," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2011, pp. 873–881.

[24] N. Gatsis, A. Ribeiro, and G. B. Giannakis, "A class of convergent algorithms for resource allocation in wireless fading networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 1808–1823, 2010.

[25] J. C. Duchi, S. Chaturapruek, and C. Ré, "Asynchronous stochastic convex optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.00882*, 2015.

[26] B. Sirb and X. Ye, "Decentralized consensus algorithm with delayed and stochastic gradients," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.05649*, 2016.

[27] X. Lin, N. B. Shroff, and R. Srikant, "A tutorial on cross-layer optimization in wireless networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1452–1463, 2006.

[28] C. G. Lopes and A. H. Sayed, "Incremental adaptive strategies over distributed networks," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Proc.*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 4064–4077, 2007.

[29] M. G. Rabbat and R. D. Nowak, "Quantized incremental algorithms for distributed optimization," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 798–808, 2005.

[30] A. Nedic and D. P. Bertsekas, "Incremental subgradient methods for nondifferentiable optimization," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 109–138, 2001.

[31] D. P. Bertsekas, "A new class of incremental gradient methods for least squares problems," *SIAM J. on Optim.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 913–926, 1997.

[32] L. Bottou, "Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent," in *Proceedings of COMPSTAT*. Springer, 2010, pp. 177–186.

[33] E. Moulines and F. R. Bach, "Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms for machine learning," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2011, pp. 451–459.

[34] L. Bottou, "Stochastic gradient descent tricks," in *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade*. Springer, 2012, pp. 421–436.

[35] M. J. Neely, "Asynchronous control for coupled markov decision systems," in *Proc. of the IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop*, 2012, pp. 287–291.

[36] A. H. Sayed and X. Zhao, "Asynchronous adaptive networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.09180*, 2015.

[37] S. Sra, A. W. Yu, M. Li, and A. J. Smola, "Adadelay: Delay adaptive distributed stochastic convex optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.05003*, 2015.

[38] H. R. Feyzmahdavian, A. Aytekin, and M. Johansson, "An asynchronous mini-batch algorithm for regularized stochastic optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.04824*, 2015.

[39] C. M. De Sa, C. Zhang, K. Olukotun, and C. Ré, "Taming the wild: A unified analysis of hogwild-style algorithms," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2015, pp. 2656–2664.

[40] J. Liu and S. J. Wright, "Asynchronous stochastic coordinate descent: Parallelism and convergence properties," *SIAM J. Optim*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 351–376, 2015.

[41] E. Wei and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed alternating direction method of multipliers," in *51st IEEE CDC*, Dec 2012, pp. 5445–5450.

[42] J. F. Mota, J. M. Xavier, P. M. Aguiar, and M. Püschel, "D-ADMM: A communication-efficient distributed algorithm for separable optimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 2718–2723, 2013.

[43] B. Shitovitz, "Oligopoly in markets with a continuum of traders," *Econometrica*, pp. 467–501, 1973.

[44] Z.-Q. Luo and S. Zhang, "Dynamic spectrum management: Complexity and duality," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 57–73, 2008.

[45] A. Ribeiro and G. Giannakis, "Separation Principles in Wireless Networking," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, Sept 2010.

[46] H. Hermes and J. P. Lasalle, *Functional analysis and time optimal control*. Academic Press, 1969.

[47] A. G. Marques, L. M. Lopez-Ramos, G. B. Giannakis, and J. Ramos, "Resource allocation for interweave and underlay CRs under probability-of-interference constraints," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 1922–1933, 2012.

[48] X. Wang and G. B. Giannakis, "Resource allocation for wireless multiuser ofdm networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 4359–4372, 2011.

[49] A. Eshragh and J. Filar, "Hamiltonian cycles, random walks, and discounted occupational measures," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 258–270, 2011.

[50] M. Li, D. G. Andersen, A. J. Smola, and K. Yu, "Communication efficient distributed machine learning with the parameter server," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2014, pp. 19–27.

[51] M. Rabbat and R. Nowak, "Distributed optimization in sensor networks," in *Proc. IEEE Inform. Process. in Sensor Networks*, 2004, pp. 20–27.

[52] T. Chen, A. Mokhtari, X. Wang, A. Ribeiro, and G. B. Giannakis, "Stochastic averaging for constrained optimization with application to online resource allocation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02143*, 2016.

[53] H. Dahrouj and W. Yu, "Coordinated beamforming for the multi-cell multi-antenna wireless system," in *42nd Annual Conf. on Inf. Sciences and Systems,*, March 2008, pp. 429–434.

[54] A. Nedić and D. Bertsekas, "Convergence rate of Incremental Subgradient Algorithms," in *Stochastic Optimization: Algorithms and Applications*. Springer, 2001, pp. 223–264.